

Gabriela Matos, “TP ellipsis with polarity particles” [accepted]

To be published in (2017)

Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 12.

Selected Papers from the 45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages.

Edited by: Ruth Lopes, Juanito Avelar and Sonia. Cyrino.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

ISBN: 9789027203922 or

ISBN: 9789027265302.

TP ellipsis with polarity particles

Gabriela Matos

Universidade de Lisboa

TP-ellipsis with polarity particles exhibits island effects not only in cases of long-distance movement of the remnant but also when the remnant does not cross any island, showing that some non-overt element moves from the elided TP. Also in non-island contexts, TP-ellipsis with non-local antecedents is sensitive to finiteness. Correlating these properties I will argue that the null-T, the head of the elided TP, moves, for scope reasons, to the topmost sentence that relates the elliptical site to the sentence containing its antecedent. The resulting T-chains, which must preserve the finiteness value of each link, constitute a requirement for the identification of the elliptical-TP.

Keywords: TP-ellipsis, islands, finiteness, parataxis, parallelism, T-chains

1. Introduction

TP-ellipsis with polarity particles (henceforth TP-ellipsis) is a construction that occurs in Romance languages, as illustrated for Portuguese and Spanish, respectively in (1) and (2):

- (1) a. *O João leu esse artigo, mas eu não.*
the João read that paper, but I not.
'João read that paper, but I did not.'
- b. *Os turistas não visitaram a igreja, e o museu também não.*
the tourists not visited the church, and the museum also not
'The tourists did not visit the church, and the museum neither.'
- c. *O miúdo não obedece à mãe, mas ao pai sim.*
the kid not obeys to.the mother, but to.the father yes
'The kid does not obey his mother, but he does obey his father.'
- d. *Ele vai sair hoje e amanhã também.*
he will go.out today and tomorrow too.
'He will go out today and tomorrow too.'

- (2) a. *Julia ha hecho los deberes y Miguel no.*
 Julia has done the assignments and Miguel not
 'Julia did her assignments and Miguel did not.' (Brucart 1987:146)
- b. *Luis saludó a Maria y Antonia también.*
 Luis greeted ACC Maria and Antonia too.
 'Luis greeted Maria and Antonia too.' (Brucart 1987:7)
- c. *Juan no desaprobó a Maria pero a Ana sí.*
 Juan not failed ACC Maria but ACC Ana yes
 'Juan did not fail Maria but he failed Ana.' (Saab 2010:74)
- d. *Juan no desaprobó a Maria y a Ana tampoco.*
 Juan not failed ACC Maria and ACC Ana neither
 'Juan did not fail Maria and Ana neither.' (Saab 2010:74)

In the examples above the remnant of the ellipsis corresponds to one of the arguments of the verb or to an adjunct of the elided TP and precedes the polarity expression, which introduces identical or opposite polarity regarding the antecedent sentence.

Considering Spanish, Saab (2008, 2010) convincingly shows that TP-ellipsis presents island effects in contexts of long-distance movement of the remnant over an elliptical structure that contains a strong island.

Mainly focusing on European Portuguese (henceforth EP), this paper will show that island effects in TP-ellipsis with polarity items are not limited to long extraction of the remnant, and also occur when the remnant does not cross any island. In effect, although the elliptical TP and the antecedent may appear in verb complement clauses, they may not be contained within an island and must ultimately be included inside sentences related by a paratactic link. In addition, in non-island domains, TP-ellipsis with non-local antecedents is sensitive to finiteness, a property not mentioned in recent literature.

These constraints indicate that the deletion/recovering of TP-ellipsis involves the identification of the elliptical site and its antecedent. This requires parallelism of the structural configurations where the ellipsis and the antecedent occur and uniformity of the T-chains regarding the finiteness features of the elided TP and its antecedent.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the properties of TP ellipsis and sketches the structure involved in this construction in EP; Section 3 deals with TP-ellipsis sensitivity to island domains: the cases of long movement of the remnant across an island are considered as well as the cases of island sensitivity without remnant movement; Section 4 presents evidence that TP-ellipsis requires T-features identity with respect to its antecedent and is sensitive to finiteness when the elided TP exhibits a non-local antecedent, which suggests that the identification

of null-T in TP-ellipsis involves T-chains that require parallel domains and finiteness homogeneity; Section 5 summarizes the main proposals of the paper.

2. The structure of TP-ellipsis

2.1 Stripping, TP-ellipsis and bare phrase construction

Since 1990s it has been shown that *Stripping* in English (Ross 1969; Hankamer and Sag 1976; Reinhart 1991), illustrated in (3), corresponds to two different constructions in Romance (Matos 1992, 2003, 2013; Depiante 2000): *TP-ellipsis*, exemplified in (1)–(2) above, which does not find a consistent correlation with Stripping cases in English, and a construction that does not seem to involve ellipsis in overt syntax, exemplified in (4), which I will call *bare phrase construction*.

- (3) a. Mary gives chocolates to his son, but not vegetables.
 b. A: John loves Mary.
 B: Me too.

Several properties distinguish these two constructions. A first difference relies on the position of the polarity particles: as shown in (1)–(2), in TP-ellipsis the polarity items follow the verbal argument or adjunct; in contrast, in the bare phrasal construction they precede it:

- (4) a. *Ele telefonou à Ana, mas não à Maria.*
 he called to.the Ana, but not to.the Maria
 ‘He called Ana, but not Maria.’
 b. *Ele não come bolachas, mas sim chocolates.*
 he not eats cookies, but yes chocolates
 ‘He does not eat cookies, but he eats chocolates.’
 c. *Eles foram ao teatro hoje e também ontem.*
 they went to.the theater today and also yesterday
 ‘They went to the theater today, and yesterday too.’

Additionally, not all the polarity items may appear in both constructions. For instance, *também não* ‘also not/neither’ in Portuguese only occurs in TP ellipsis, (5), and is excluded from the bare phrase construction, (6):

- (5) *Ele não telefonou à Ana, e à Maria também não.*
 he not called to.the Ana, and to.the Maria also not
 ‘He did not call Ana, and he did not call Maria either.’

- (6) **Ele não telefonou à Ana, e também não à Maria.*
 he not called to.the Ana, and also not to.the Maria
 ‘He did not call Ana, and Maria neither.’

In addition, while TP ellipsis may appear within a subordinate clause, (7), the bare phrase construction is banned from this context, (8):

- (7) a. *Ele não telefonou à Ana, mas penso que à Maria sim.*
 he not called to.the Ana, but think that to.the Maria yes
 ‘He did not call Ana, but I think that he called Maria.’
 b. *Esse miúdo come bolachas, mas a mãe diz que*
 that kid eats cookies, but the mother says that
chocolates não.
 chocolates not
 ‘That kid eats cookies, but his mother says that he does not eat chocolates.’
 (8) a. **Ele não telefonou à Ana, mas penso que sim. à Maria.*
 he not called to.the Ana, but think that yes to.the Maria
 b. **Ele come bolachas, mas a Maria diz que não chocolates*
 he eats cookies, but the Maria says that not chocolates.

In sum, in Portuguese, as in Spanish, there are two different constructions that involve a contrastive phrase and polarity items. Yet, just one of them may occur in a CP phase, as a complement of C and is clearly a case of TP ellipsis. In the remaining part of this paper I will concentrate on this construction.

2.2 The TP-ellipsis structure

Elaborating on Laka (1990), Matos (1992) for Portuguese, and Depiante (2000) for Spanish, assume that TP-Ellipsis involves ΣP , a projection below CP proposed in Laka (1990) to host emphatic polarity items and Focus phrases. According to Laka, in Spanish ΣP occurs above TP:

- (9) [CP [Σ [TP]]]

Yet, departing from Laka, Depiante (2000: 73) considers that ΣP is occupied only by the polarity items and the remnant of TP-ellipsis that precedes them occurs in FocusP, as a contrastive focus.

- (10) a. *Ana ha estado en California, pero en Colorado no.*
 Ana has been in California, but in Colorado not.
 ‘Ana has been in California, but not in Colorado.’
 b. ..._[FocP] [en Colorado]_i [_{ΣP} no [_{TP} ~~Ana há estado t_i~~]]]

In turn, Depiante (2004) and Saab (2008, 2010) claim that the remnant of TP-ellipsis in Spanish is a Topic in a CLLD construction, which moves into Spec,TopP leaving a pronominal clitic inside the elided TP:

- (11) [_{CP} [_{TopP} remnant_i [_{ΣP} polarity item [_{TP} ...CL_i...]]]]

In contrast, Matos (1992) argues that in EP, the remnant of TP-ellipsis is a contrastive focus, not a Topic, based on the fact that in CLLD and Topicalization the constituent in Topic may not be an indefinite quantifier or a negated element (see the contrast in (12)), but these elements may appear as remnants in TP-ellipsis (13):¹

- (12) a. *Esses artigos, eu li t.*
 these papers, I read
 ‘These papers, I read.’
 b. ??{ *Alguns artigos / *nenhum artigo* }, eu li t.
 some papers / no paper I read
 (13) a. *A Ana leu o livro, e alguns artigos também.*
 the Ana read the book, and some papers too.
 ‘Ana read the book, and some papers too.’
 b. *A Ana não leu o livro, nem nenhum artigo também.*
 the Ana not read the book, nor no paper too
 ‘Ana did not read the book, and no paper either.’

Relying on these data, and departing from Matos (1992), I will adopt Depiante’s (2000) proposal, and assume the representation in (14) to account for TP-ellipsis in Portuguese:

- (14) [_{CP} [_{FocP} remnant_i [_{ΣP} polarity item [_{TP} ...t_i ...]]]]

1. Notice that (12b) would be acceptable in a contrastive context, as in (i). However, (i) illustrates a different construction. It is interpreted as a contrastive focus rather than a case of topicalization. In fact, in (i) the fronted object exhibits an overt contrastive correlate, *outros* ‘others’, and receives contrastive stress:

(i) *ALGUNS ARTIGOS eu li, outros não.*
 some papers I read others not
 ‘Some papers I read, others I did not.’

In (14), [_{TP} ... t_i ...] corresponds to the elided TP, which includes t_i, the copy of the remnant moved to a contrastive focus position in the sentence left periphery (Rizzi 1997). In fact, there is evidence that the remnant of TP-ellipsis moves to an A'-position, considering its sensitivity to strong islands, as shown in 3.1.

3. TP-ellipsis and island sensitivity

3.1 The exclusion of remnant long movement across islands

Depiante (2004) and Saab (2008) characterize TP-ellipsis in Spanish as an instance of the CLLD, a construction that Zubizarreta (1999) has shown to exhibit sensitivity to strong islands in this language. Thus, Saab (2008, 2010) presents evidence that TP-ellipsis in Spanish allows long-distance movement of the remnant with bridge verbs, (15), but displays island effects when the remnant crosses strong islands, e.g., a DP Complex with a relative clause (16a) or an Adjunct island (16b):

- (15) A: *Yo no dije [que desaprobaran a Ana.*
 I not said that failed ACC Ana
 'I did not say that they failed Ana.'
- B: *Ya sé. Y a Maria tampoco [dijiste que la*
 already know. And ACC Maria neither said that CL
~~*desaprobáron*~~. (Saab 2010:87)
 failed
 'I know. And neither did you say that they failed Maria.'
- (16) a. A: *Juan no conoce al profesor que desaprobó a Ana.*
 Juan not knows the professor that failed ACC Ana
 'Juan does not know the professor that failed Ana.'
- B: **E a Maria tampouco [Juan conoce al profesor que*
 and ACC Maria neither Juan knows the professor that
~~*la desaprobó*~~ (Saab 2010:89)
 her.CL failed
 'And neither does he know the professor that failed Maria.'
- b. A: *Adiviná qué? Juan está enojado solo porque la*
 guess what? Juan is angry only because CL
~~*desaprobáran a Ana.*~~
 failed ACC Ana
 'Guess what? Juan is angry just because they failed Ana.'

- B: *Se enoja por todo.* *A *Maria también.*
 CL gets.angry by everything. ACC Maria also
 ‘He gets angry about everything. He is also angry because they failed
 María.’ (Saab 2010:88)

Portuguese corroborates Saab’s analysis. In TP-ellipsis, the movement of the remnant across islands produces unacceptability. Thus, while (17) with long movement of the remnant in non-island contexts is grammatical, (18B), and (19) are marginal:

- (17) *Eu não disse que eles falaram à Maria e à Ana_i*
 I not said that they spoke to.the Maria and to.the Ana
também não [disse eu que eles falaram t_i]
 also not said I that they spoke
 ‘I did not say that they spoke to Maria, and neither did I say that they spoke to Ana.’
- (18) A: *Nós não conhecemos o professor que falou à Maria_i*
 we not know the professor that spoke to.the Maria
ontem.
 yesterday
 ‘We do not know the professor that spoke to Maria yesterday.’
- B: **E à Ana_i também não [conhecemos o professor que*
 and to.the Ana also not know.1PL the professor that
falou t_i ontem].
 spoke yesterday
 ‘And to Ana neither do we know the professor that spoke.’
- (19) **Eles não pensam que as crianças estão assustadas porque vão*
 they not think that the children are frightened because go
à escola], mas ao dentista sim [eles pensam que as
 to.the school, but to.the dentist yes they think that the
crianças estão assustadas porque vão t_i]
 children are frightened because go
 ‘They do not think that the children are frightened because they are going to school but they think that the children are frightened because they are going to the dentist.’

In sum, in TP-ellipsis with polarity items, the remnant moves to an A’-position in Portuguese and Spanish: in EP the remnant is a contrastive focus that occur in specifier of FocP; in Spanish it is a contrastive topic in a CLLD construction.

To account for island sensitivity in TP-ellipsis in Spanish, Saab (2008, 2010) claims that the remnant, which establishes a contrastive nexus with its antecedent, leaves a copy that cannot be deleted. The interposition of an island prevents the identity relation among the chain links; these links cannot be deleted at PF and a linearization problem at PF arises (Nunes 2004).

As far as remnant movement is concerned, I consider that an analysis along the lines of Saab (2008, 2010) may be extended to Portuguese.

3.2 Exclusion from islands without remnant movement

Island effects in TP-ellipsis may also occur when the remnant does not cross any island, as shown for Portuguese in Matos (1992, 2003, 2013), and also pointed out for Spanish in Saab (2008). The examples in (20) and (21) illustrate this fact for Portuguese:²

- (20) a. **O João não pediu ajuda a ninguém, mas sabe de alunos*
the João not asked help to nobody but knows of students
que ao professor_i sim [pediram ajuda t_i]
that to.the teacher yes asked help
‘João did not ask for help from anybody, but he knows some students that have asked for help from their teacher’

2. Notice that (20a) would become acceptable if there is no remnant movement inside the island as in (i). I consider that the contrast in acceptability between (20a) and (i) cannot be due to the interposition of the remnant between the relativized constituent and its trace. As shown in (ii), there is no incompatibility between relativization and contrastive focus in EP:

- (i) *O João não pediu ajuda a ninguém, mas sabe de alunos que sim.*
the João not asked help to nobody but knows of students that yes
‘João did not ask for help from anybody, but he knows some students that did it’.
- (ii) *[os alunos que A NINGUÉM_i pedem ajuda t_i] têm elevado grau de*
the students that to no one ask help have high degree of
auto-estima.
self-confidence

‘The students that do not ask for help from anybody have a high degree of self-confidence.’

The differences between (20a) and (i) are possibly due to the structures involved. The lack of island effects in (i) shows that no constituent has moved out of the relative clause, which suggests that in (i) there is no TP-ellipsis. This corroborates Hagemeijer & Santos’s (2003) claim that in certain constructions the polarity items in EP behave as sentential proforms that do not select any elliptical IP.

- b. ?**O Rui estudou fonologia, mas espalhou-se o boato de que*
the Rui studied Phonology, but spread-CL the rumor of that
sintaxe não [pro não estudou t_i]
Syntax not not studied
‘Rui has studied Phonology, but the rumor spread that he has not studied Syntax.’
- c. **Ele vai ao cinema, sempre que a Ana_i também [t_i vai*
he goes to.the movies, always that the Ana also goes
ao cinema].
to.the movies.
‘He goes to the movies whenever Ana goes to the movies too.’
- d. **A Ana fala Inglês, mas [que o Rui_i não [t_i fala Inglês]*
the Ana speaks English, but that the Rui not speaks English
é óbvio.
is obvious
‘Ana speaks English, but it is obvious that Rui does not.’
- (21) a. **A Maria não vai ao jantar, mas perguntou quem_i à*
the Maria not goes to.the dinner, but asked who to.the
festa_j sim [t_i goes t_j].
party yes vai
‘Maria is not going to the dinner, but she asked who is going to the party.’
- b. **O Rui saiu com os amigos e lamenta que nós não*
the Rui went.out with the friends and regrets that we not
[tenhamos saído com os amigos].
have gone out with the friends
‘Rui went out with his friends and regrets that we did not.’

The examples in (19) contain strong islands: DP complex islands in (20a)–(20b), Adjunct island in (20c), and Subject island in (20d); the examples in (21) include weak islands: Wh-island in (21a), and Factive island in (21b). However, in all these cases, the remnant has only undergone local movement, remaining next to the elliptical TP, inside the island, as shown in (22):

- (22) ... [_{CP} C [remnant_i [_{ΣP} polarity item [_{TP} ... t_i ...]]]]

The Wh-island violation may be explained by Rizzi’s (1997, 2004) proposal of the structure of the sentence left periphery, represented in (23):

- (23) [_{ForceP} Force [_{TopP} Top* [... [_{FocP} Foc [_{TopP} Top* [... [_{FinP} Fin [_{TP} T...]]]]]]

According to Rizzi, in the derivation of wh-questions the wh-phrase must move to Spec,FocP. Assuming a bottom up derivation, a Wh-island violation arises in (21a), because the whP may not be internally merged in this position, since this one is already occupied by the remnant of TP ellipsis, which is interpreted as a contrastive focus in EP (Section 2.2).

Yet, this explanation cannot be extended to (20a): the relativized element does not move to Spec,FocP and is compatible with a contrastive focus (see footnote 2). Also, in the remaining island violations illustrated in (20b)–(20d) and (21) no element has overtly moved out of the CP containing the elided TP.

Hence, the island effects indicate that some null element has moved from this elliptical CP.

The ban of TP-ellipsis from island domains elucidates the kind of contexts required for this construction: although it may occur in verb complement subordinate clauses, these ones must ultimately be included in sentences connected by a paratactic link of coordination or juxtaposition:

- (24) *O professor foi à reunião e acho que os alunos*
 the professor went to.the meeting and think that the students
também [TP –]].
 too.

‘The professor went to the meeting and I think that the students did too.’

- (25) A: *Acho que não vou a essa reunião.*
 think that not go to that meeting
 ‘I think that I will not go to that meeting.’

B: *Os rapazes dizem que eles_i também não [t_i vão a essa reunião].*
 the boys say that they also not go to that meeting
 ‘The boys say that they will not go to that meeting either.’

In sum, these constraints on the occurrence of TP-ellipsis show that TP-ellipsis involves movement of a null constituent and requires paratactic domains that present parallelism of the connected sentential terms.

4. The identification of the head of TP-ellipsis

I raise the hypothesis that the ban of islands and the requirement of parallelism in TP-ellipsis are structural conditions for the identification of null T, the head of the elliptical TP.

4.1 The identity of T-features

The elliptical T and its antecedent may vary in ϕ -features, as in (26), where the omitted and the antecedent verb present different person and number features, or in mood, as in (27), where the antecedent occurs in the Subjunctive and the elided TP in the Indicative. However, they require strict identity with respect to tense features, as shown in (28a) vs. (28b)–(28c): in contrast with (28b)–(28c), in (28a) the Present occurs both in the antecedent and in the null TP.³

- (26) *O Rui saiu de casa e nós_i também [t_i ~~saimos~~ de casa]*
 the Rui left.3SG of house and we also left.1PL of house
 ‘Rui left home and so did we.’
- (27) *Talvez ela vá à livraria, mas eu_i não [t_i ~~vou~~ à livraria].*
 perhaps she go.SUBJUN to.the bookstore, but I not go.INDIC to.the bookstore
 ‘Perhaps she is going to the bookstore but I am not.’
- (28) a. *Nós vamos ao restaurante hoje e amanhã_i também*
 we go.PRST to.the restaurant today and tomorrow also
[vamos ao restaurante t_i].
 go.PRST to.the restaurant
 ‘We will go to the restaurant today and tomorrow too.’
- b. **Nós fomos ao restaurante hoje, e amanhã_i também*
 we go.PAST to.the restaurant today and tomorrow also
[vamos ao restaurante t_i].
 go.PRST to.the restaurant
 ‘We went to the restaurant today, and tomorrow we will too.’
- c. **Nós não vamos ao restaurante hoje, e ontem_i também*
 we not go.PRST to.the restaurant today, and yesterday also
não [fomos ao restaurante t_i].
 not go.PAST to.the restaurant
 ‘We will not go to the restaurant today, and yesterday we did not either.’

In sum, the tense features of the elided TP must be identified as identical to those of the antecedent TP.

3. See Saab (2010:92), for Spanish.

4.2 TP ellipsis, finiteness and T-chains

The contrasts in (29a)–(29b) show that finiteness also plays a role in the identification of null-T:

- (29) a. *Os alunos disseram que faltam às aulas e admitiram*
 the students said that skip.FIN to.the classes and admitted
que às reuniões_i também [TP ~~pro~~ ~~faltam~~ t_i]
 that to.the meetings also skip. FIN
 ‘The students said that they skip classes and admitted that they also skip meetings.’
- b. **Os alunos disseram [ter faltado às aulas] e*
 the students said have.INF skipped to.the classes and
admitiram às reuniões_i também [T ~~pro~~ ~~terem~~ ~~faltado~~ t_i]
 admitted to.the meetings also have.INF skipped
 ‘The students said they have skipped classes and admitted to have also skipped meetings.’

TP ellipsis is sensitive to finiteness when the elided TP has a long distance antecedent, i.e. when the antecedent does not c-command the elliptical sentence, as it happens in (30), where the elliptical and the antecedent clauses are embedded in two main coordinate clauses (CP₁, CP₂):

- (30) [_{CoP} [_{CP1} main clause [_{CP} antecedent]] [_{Co} [_{CP2} main clause [_{CP} elided TP]]]]

Thus, (29a) is well formed, since the elliptical T and its antecedent (in the Indicative) have finite T-features; in contrast, (29b) is marginal, because the elliptical T and its antecedent are non-finite.

However, if TP-ellipsis has a local antecedent, i.e. an antecedent sentence that locally c-commands the elliptical clause, there is no loss of acceptability. This is what happens in (31), where the antecedent and the elliptical sentences are coordinated under the same main clause:

- (31) [_{CP} main clause [_{CoP} [_{CP} antecedent] [_{Co} [_{CP} elided TP]]]]

In this case, both (32a) and (32b) are well formed, despite the fact that in (32b) the elided TP and its local antecedent are [–finite]:

- (32) a. *Eles dizem que faltaram às aulas mas que à*
 they said that skipped.FIN to.the classes but that to.the
reunião_i não [TP eles não faltaram t_i]
 meeting not they not skipped
 ‘They say that they skipped classes, but that they did not skip the meeting.’
- b. *Eles disseram não faltar às aulas mas às reuniões_i*
 they said not skip.INF to.the classes but to.the meetings
sim [TP PRO faltar t_i].
 yes
 ‘They said that they do not skip classes, but skip meetings.’

Notice that the acceptability of the local infinitival TP-ellipsis indicates that, as far as focus and polarity projections are concerned, infinitival clauses in TP-ellipsis do not have a leaner structure than finite ones.

4.3 T-ellipsis and recovering under identity

The data analyzed so far show that TP-ellipsis with polarity particles is excluded from islands and is sensitive to finiteness when it has a non-local antecedent. Correlating these facts, I raise the hypothesis that TP-ellipsis involves T-movement, forming T-chains able to identify null T, the head of the elided TP.

In TP-ellipsis this movement occurs, for scope reasons, to the CP that relates the elliptical sentences and its antecedent. A T-chain is formed, whose only relevant feature is finiteness. In fact, the finite verbs in the main and in the embedded clause may exhibit different tense values, e.g., present vs. past, as in (29a), *admitiram* ‘admitted’ and *faltam* ‘skip’.

Accepting the correlation between C and T, usually conceived as a discontinuous head (Chomsky 2004, 2008, 2013), I assume that null-T moves to T in C, i.e. Fin in Rizzi’s (1997) framework.

When TP-ellipsis has a local antecedent, as in (32a)–(32b), there are no restrictions on the $[\pm\text{finiteness}]$ values of the T-chain, (33):

- (33) $[_{CP/ForceP} [_{FocP} \text{remnant} [_{\Sigma P} \text{pol} [_{FinP} [\pm\text{fin}]_i [_{TP-elided} [_T \pm\text{fin}]_i]]]]]]$

However, in case of long distance antecedents, $[\text{+finiteness}]$ is required and $T_{+\text{fin}}$ moves head-to-head, adjoining to the relevant Fin heads, (34):

- (34) $[_{CP/ForceP} [_{FinP} [_T t_{+\text{fin}} [_{Fin} \text{+fin}]]] [_{TP} \text{main} [_T t_{+\text{fin}} [_T \text{+fin}]]] [_{CP} [_{FocP} \text{remnant} [_{\Sigma P} \text{pol} [_{FinP} [_{Fin} t_{+\text{fin}} [_{Fin} \text{+fin}]]] [_{TP-elided} [_T t_{+\text{fin}}]]]]]]]]]]]$

How to explain the [\pm finiteness] restrictions in TP ellipsis? A reasonable hypothesis is that the T-chains must obey to a requirement of homogeneity in order to allow for the recovering of TP-ellipsis. When TP-ellipsis has a local antecedent, as in (31), Fin is homogeneously finite or non-finite, (35):

$$(35) \quad [_{CoP} [_{CP} [_{TP_antecedent} [\pm fin]]] [_{Co} [_{CP/ForceP} [\pm fin_i] [_{TP_elided} [_{T} \pm fin_i]]]]]$$

But in the case of long distance antecedents, TP-ellipsis is embedded in a subordinating finite clause. When the null-T raises to the topmost CP that relates it to its antecedent, only a [+finite] value for the elliptical T head guaranties that each link of the chain is homogenous, regarding the finiteness value.

However, although the homogeneity of the chain links is a necessary requirement, it is not a sufficient condition. Otherwise non-finite TP-ellipsis with non-local antecedents would be well-formed if the homogeneity of the chain links is preserved. Nevertheless, (36) shows that this is not true:

$$(36) \quad *Os \text{ rapazes } disseram [_{CoP} [planear [faltar \text{ às aulas}]] \text{ e } \\ \text{the boys said } planear.INF \text{ miss.INF to.the classes and } \\ [admitir [às reuniões_i \text{ também } [_{TP} \text{ pro } faltar t_i]]]. \\ \text{admit.INF to.the meetings too}$$

Accepting that infinitival T has defective features regarding finiteness, I conclude that $T_{[-fin]}$ is unable to form a chain. Thus, null T in non-finite TP-ellipsis is identified by $[-Fin]$ in the antecedent CP that locally c-commands the CP containing the elided TP.

The analysis proposed accounts for the island effects in TP-ellipsis with non-local antecedents: the interposition of an island would break the T-chain.

Notice that islands are also excluded from the sentence containing the antecedent:

- (37) a. **Vimos [os alunos que faltaram às aulas] e disseram-nos*
saw the students that skipped to.the classes and told us.CL
que à reunião_i também[pro tinham faltado t_i]
that to.the meeting also had skipped
'We saw the students that had skipped classes and they told us that they had also skipped the meeting.'
- b. **Sempre que ela não fica em casa, ele_i sim [t_i fica em casa]*
always that she not stays at home, he yes stays at home
'Whenever she does not stay at home, he does.'

These island effects suggests that the $T_{[+fin]}$ features of the antecedent also raise to the topmost CP connected to the CP containing TP-ellipsis, forming a parallel T-chain which allows the identification of the null-T.

Accepting that island effects do not take place at LF, I consider that $[+Fin]$ -features move from Fin-T in overt Syntax. Notice, however, that non-visible movement in Syntax can be expected to occur, given that syntactic objects are feature-bundles only spelled out at PF (Chomsky 1995, and subsequent work).

5. Summarizing

In TP-ellipsis with polarity particles island effects arise in cases of remnant long movement and TP-ellipsis with long distance antecedents. The approach proposed regarding remnant long movement largely adopts Saab's (2008, 2010) proposals.

However, it departs from it regarding the island effects displayed by TP-ellipsis when the remnant is adjacent to the elliptical site. The latter island effects have been related to the recovering conditions of the null head of the elided TP. The correlation between the exclusion of TP-ellipsis and its antecedent from islands and the sensitivity to finiteness when TP-ellipsis has a long distant antecedent permitted us to infer that these island effects should be motivated by T-movement with finite features to the topmost CP of the sentences that include the elliptical TP and its antecedent. The interposition of an island would break the chain, preventing the identification of the elliptical site.

The requirement on T-chains with $[+fin]$ features in TP-ellipsis with non-local antecedents results from the need to preserve the links of the T-chain to allow the recovering of the null-T. In effect, due to defectiveness, $T[-fin]$ cannot form a T-chain able to identify the null-T; thus, non-finite TP-ellipsis requires a local c-commanding antecedent.

Acknowledgements

This work was developed within the FCT project UID/LIN/00214/2013. I would like to thank the audience of the *45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* and especially the two anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on a previous version of this paper.

References

- Brucart, José. 1987. *La elision Sintáctica en Español*. Bellaterra: Publ. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond Explanatory Adequacy. In *Structures and Beyond: the Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 3, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 104–131. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. “On Phases”. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Robert Freidin, Carlos Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta, 133–166. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. doi:10.7551/mitpress/9780262062787.003.0007
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. “Problems of projection”. *Lingua* 130: 33–49. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2012.12.003
- Depiante, Marcela. 2000. *The syntax of Deep and Surface Anaphora: a Study of Null Complement Anaphora and Stripping/Bare Argument Ellipsis*. PhD Dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Depiante, Marcela. 2004. “Dos casos de elipsis con partículas de polaridad en Español”. *RASAL* 1: 53–69.
- Hagemeijer, Tijerk, and Ana-Lúcia Santos. 2003. “Elementos polares na periferia direita”. *Actas do XIX ENAPL* 465–476. Lisboa: APL.
- Hankamer, Jorge, and Ivan Sag. 1976. “Deep and Surface Anaphora”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 521–557.
- Laka, Itziar. 1990. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. PhD thesis, MIT.
- Matos, M. Gabriela. 1992. *Construções de Elipse do Predicado em Português -SV Nulo e Despojamento*. PhD thesis. Universidade de Lisboa. http://alfclul.clul.ul.pt/web/PhD_GABRIELA_MATOS1992.pdf
- Matos, Gabriela. 2003. “Construções elípticas”. In *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*, ed. by M. Helena Mateus, Ana Brito, Inês Duarte, Isabel Faria, Sónia Frota, Gabriela Matos, Fátima Oliveira, Marina Vigário, and Alina Villalva, 869–913. Lisboa: Caminho.
- Matos, Gabriela. 2013. “Elipse”. In *Gramática do Português*, ed. by Raposo, Eduardo M. Fernanda Nascimento, M. Antónia Mota, Luísa Segura, and Amália Mendes, vol. 2, 2351–2386. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1991. “Non-quantificational LF”. In *The Chomskian Turn*, ed. by A. Kasher. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. “The fine structure of the left periphery”. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Lilian Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer. doi:10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. “Locality and Left Periphery”. In *The Structures and Beyond- the Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, vol. 3, 223–251. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, John. 1969. “Guess who”. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by R. Binnick, A. Davidson, G. Green and J. Morgan, 252–286. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Saab, Andrés. 2008. *Hacia una teoría de la identidad parcial en la ellipsis*. PhD thesis. Universidad de Buenos Aires.

- Saab, Andrés. 2010. "Silent interactions: Spanish TP-ellipsis and the theory of island repair". *Probus* 22: 73–116. doi:10.1515/prbs.2010.003
- Zubizarreta, María Luísa. 1999. "Las funciones informativas: tema y foco". In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque, and Violeta Demonte, vol. 3, 4215–4244. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.